

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action stated that claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, formal issues must be overcome.

Accordingly, to avoid art rejections, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2. Claim 2 is canceled.

In addition, concerning the formal objections, the recitation in original claim 1 is clarified. However, the Examiner's understanding that all the conditions of claim 2 are met under the magnetic field conditions recited in claim 1 is incorrect. As shown in the Examples in the specification, core loss is not measured under the d.c. magnetic field of 12000A/m. Furthermore, applicants advise that it has been verified experimentally that core loss is not influenced by applied magnetic permeability. Thus, the additional limitation to claim 2 is without meaning.


Appl. No. 10/630,193  
Reply to Office Action of December 10, 2003

Claim 4 is amended to clarify that the Examiner's assumption is correct with respect to the winding.

Entry of this AMENDMENT and allowance of the application are therefore respectfully requested.

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman  
& Chick, P.C.  
767 Third Ave., 25th Floor  
New York, NY 10017-2023  
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900  
Fax No.: (212) 319-5101  
MJC/lld

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARSHALL J. CHICK  
Reg. No. 26,853